

**REMARKS**

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 23, 2003 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 3). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

**Status of the Claims**

As outlined above, claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 are being amended to correct formal errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

**Formal Objections or Rejections**

Claims 4, 11, 18, and 22 were objected to due to typographical errors. Applicants respectfully submit that the typographical errors have been remedied and the objections are rendered moot.

**Prior Art Rejections**

Claims 1, 7, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Yuuki *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,147,725 (further, Yuuki '725). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites a liquid crystal display device comprising a liquid crystal panel having a display area, a backlight being disposed at a rear surface side of the liquid crystal panel, and a diffusing sheet and a prism sheet lying between the rear surface of the liquid crystal panel and the backlight, wherein the backlight has a substantially rectangular-shaped light guide plate and a linear lamp being disposed along a incidence plane provided at one side of the light guide plate, a light emission control pattern having a plurality of grooves slanted to the one side of the light guide plate are formed at a corner portion of the one side of the light guide plate on a back surface except for a center portion of the light guide plate.

Amended claim 7 recites a liquid crystal display device comprising a liquid crystal display panel having a display area, a backlight and an optical sheet disposed between the liquid crystal panel and the backlight, wherein the backlight has a light guide plate-display

panel and a linear lamp being disposed along at least one side of the light guide plate, and a plurality of grooves are formed on a back surface of the light guide plate and formed at a corner portion of the side except for a center portion of the light guide plate.

Amended claims 15 and 16 recite a liquid crystal display device comprising a liquid crystal display panel having a display area, a light guide plate, and a linear lamp disposed along one side of the light guide plate wherein the back surface of the light guide plate has a plurality of first grooves and a plurality of second grooves formed at both corner areas along the side of the light guide plate, and the plurality of first grooves are extended in a first direction slanted to the side of the light guide plate and the plurality of second grooves are extended in a second direction slanted to the side of the light guide plate. The liquid crystal display device according to claim 15, is further recited by claim 16 as wherein the plurality of first and second grooves are overlapped with the display area of the liquid crystal panel, and not formed on a center portion of the light guide plate.

The Examiner alleged in the Office Action that the disclosure of Figs. 1 and 2, Abstract and col. 9, lines 57 to 59 of Yuuki '725 anticipates the recitation of claim 1. As for claim 7, the Examiner alleged that the disclosure of Figs. 1, 2, 6, Abstract, and col. 9, lines 57 to 59 anticipates the recitation of claim 7. As for claims 15 and 16, the Examiner alleged in the Office Action that the disclosure of Figs. 1, 2, 6, Abstract, and col. 9, lines 57 to 59 anticipates the recitation of the claims. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention relates to a light guide plate disposed in a liquid crystal display device. The light guide plate of the present invention has a light emission control pattern. A plurality of grooves prevent the light reduction in the corner portions of the light source. According to amended claim 1, the light emission control pattern has a plurality of grooves slanted to the one side of the light plate that are formed at a corner portion of the one side of the light guide plate on a back surface except for a center portion of the light guide plate.

In contrast with the above, Yuuki '725 discloses a plurality of grooves formed on corner areas and a center portion of the light guide. The direction of the grooves is the same for all areas.

Based on the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the arrangement of the grooves disclosed in Yuuki '725 differs from that recited in the claim 1. Therefore, Yuuki '725 does not anticipate the recitation of claim 1 due to the fact that it does not identically

disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from and add features to amended claim 1. Therefore they are also allowable for the reasons described above in connection with claim 1.

Both claims 7 and 15 recite the feature discussed above of “the light emission control pattern having a plurality of grooves slanted to the one side of the light plate [that] are formed at a corner portion of the one side of the light guide plate on a back surface except for a center portion of the light guide plate”. Therefore, the arguments made above regarding the absence of these features from Yuuki ‘725 applies to both claims 7 and 15. Based on the same arguments that Yuuki ‘725 does not identically disclose the above mentioned feature, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuuki ‘725 does not anticipate the recitation of claims 7 and 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 7 and 15.

Claims 8 to 14 and 16 to 23 depend from and add features to amended allowable claims 7 and 15, respectively. Therefore, they are also allowable due to at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuuki *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,147,725 (further, Yuuki ‘725) in view of Masaki *et al.*, Publication No. 0005991 (further, Masaki ‘991).

As discussed above in connection with independent claims 1 and 7, the primary reference Yuuki ‘725 used to construe the above rejection does not disclose, teach or suggest all the features of the claims. Claims 2 and 9 depend from and add features to claims allowable over that primary reference. In addition to the disclosure of the primary reference, Masaki ‘991 discloses, according to the Examiner (in the office action, on page 7), a feature that would improve the surface light device of side light type and the prism sheet of the light guide plate in the present invention. However, the references, either singly or in combination, still do not disclose the features of the present invention as claimed, as discussed above. Therefore, claims 2 and 9 are allowable over the combination of references at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 7. Applicants respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejection regarding claims 2 and 9.

Other matters

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 3 to 6, 10 to 14 and 17 to 23. Applicants have not rewritten the claims in independent form due to the fact that the claims depend from and add features to allowable independent claims. Therefore they are also allowable for the reasons discussed above in response to rejections to claims 1, 7 and 15.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

January 7, 2004